

REMARKS

I. Introduction

Claims 11 to 20 are pending in the present application. In view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the presently pending claims are allowable, and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

II. Objection to Drawings

As regards the objection to the drawings, 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a) requires that “[t]he drawing in a nonprovisional application must show every feature of the invention ***specified in the claims***” (emphasis added). The aspect of “a glass plate 2.7’ which is situated in a first or a second light path 2.5, 2.5’” is found in the ***Specification***. As such, 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a) does not compel illustration of “a glass plate 2.7’ which is situated in a first or a second light path 2.5, 2.5’.” Withdrawal of this objection is therefore respectfully requested.

III. Objection to the Specification

As regards the objection to the Specification, the Examiner will note that the title has been amended herein as suggested. As such, withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

IV. Objections to Claims 11 and 16

Claims 11 and 16 were objected to for various informalities. Accordingly, claims 11 and 16 have been amended to eliminate these informalities, as follows.

Claim 11:

The phrase “of which one is shifted with respect to the other, with a modulating device in one of its light phase and light frequency, and passes through a delay line” has been changed to --one of which is shifted with respect to the other in one of its light phase and light frequency with a modulating device and passes through a delay line--. In addition, the phrase “(3.3)” has been deleted. Furthermore, the phrase “the exit surface” has been changed to --the exit face--.

Claim 16:

The phrase “on an end face of the accommodation that is distant from the measuring object” has been changed to --on an end face of the accommodation that is remote from the

measuring object--. In addition, the phrase “and the probe fiber is fixed in the rear part of the accommodation that is at least one of distant from the object and in the tube” has been changed to --and the probe fiber is fixed in at least one of the object-remote rear part of the accommodation and the tube--.

Since the above-mentioned informalities have been eliminated, it is respectfully requested that these objections be withdrawn.

V. Rejection of Claims 11 to 20 Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 11 to 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as allegedly indefinite. It is respectfully submitted that these claims are sufficiently definite for at least the following reasons.

Claim 11 has been amended to recite that the first beam component and the second beam component **are subsequently combined**, thereby eliminating any antecedent reference problem. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claim 11 is sufficiently definite.

Claim 14 has been amended to change the variable **“a”** to **“the exit angle,”** thereby eliminating any antecedent reference problem. Claim 14 is also dependent from claim 11. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claim 14 is sufficiently definite for at least these reasons and the reasons given in support of claim 11.

Claims 12 to 13 and 15 to 20 are dependent from claim 11 and are therefore sufficiently definite for at least the reasons given in support of claim 11.

In view of all of the above, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

V. Allowable Subject Matter


Applicants note with appreciation the indication of allowable subject matter contained in claim 11, as well as in claims 12 to 20, due to their dependencies from claim 11. In this regard, the Examiner will note that claims 11 and 14 have been amended herein to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph and that claims 11 and 16 have been amended to obviate formal objections thereto. It is therefore respectfully submitted that claims 11 to 20 are in condition for immediate allowance.

VI. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the presently pending claims are allowable. All issues raised by the Examiner having been addressed, an early and favorable action on the merits is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: October 1, 2007

By: 
Gerard A. Messina
Reg. No. 35,952 *Nov 2, 199*

KENYON & KENYON LLP
One Broadway
New York, New York 10004
(212) 425-7200
CUSTOMER NO. 26646